

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated July 26, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. Applicants appreciate the indication by the Examiner that claims 10 and 17 have been allowed.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-16 and 18 are rejected by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1, 5, and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-18 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0039089 to Lim (hereinafter "Lim") in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2001/0022572 to Murade (hereinafter "Murade"). Claims 6, 8, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim in view of Murade, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,115 to Aoki (hereinafter "Aoki").

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim in view of Murade is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable at least in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a first control signal line in the gate tape carrier packages, the first control signal line being together with the conductive lines to supply a first control signal to the gate driving integrated circuits mounted on the gate tape carrier packages so that the gate lines of the image display part may be sequentially driven from the first one to the last one" and "a second control signal line in the gate tape carrier packages, the second control signal line being together with the conductive lines to supply a second control signal to the gate driving integrated circuits mounted on the gate tape carrier packages so that the gate lines of the image display part may be sequentially driven from the last one to the first one." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that Lim "fails to disclose a plurality of conductive lines formed at an outer side of the image display part of the first substrate to supply

gate driving integrated circuits to be supplied to the gate line.” See Office Action, line 15-17 page 3.

The Examiner cites Murade as allegedly disclosing “a plurality of conductive lines formed at an outer side of the image display part of the first substrate to supply gates driving signals to the gate driving integrated circuits to be supplied to the gate lines.” See Office Action, line 18 page 2-line 2 page 3.

As motivation for modifying the deficiency of Lim with Murade, the Examiner states, “The reason to combine to be able to separate all the signals coming to display and be able to shield all the signals interfered from high speed clock, high frequency noise as all the signals enter on the board at the outer side of the board. Thus, it would have been obvious to one in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Murade in the teaching of Lim to be able to have display where all the signal entering the display substrate from the outside are shielded from high frequency noise to realize high precision multi level gray scale display.”

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s statement. In the claimed invention, the first and second control signals are formed in the gate tape carrier package to supply the control signal to the gate driving integrated circuit mounted on the gate tape carrier packages. In contrary to the claimed invention, Murade merely discloses “...the part of the electrically conductive line made up of the scanning line that drives a constant voltage line is extended such that the part of the electrically conductive line surrounds the image display area....” See page 7 paragraph 56. That is, the conductive line of Murade is not formed in the gate tape carrier package. Thus, Murade does not teach or suggest at least “a first control signal line in the gate tape carrier packages” and “a second control signal line in the gate tape carrier packages.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 2 and 4 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 2 and 4 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 1, which is allowable.

Claim 5 is allowable at least in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements, including, for example, “supplying a first control signal to the gate driving integrated circuits using a first control line in the gate tape carrier packages so that the gate lines of the

image display part may be sequentially driven from the last one to the first one.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 5 for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants’ arguments with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 5, and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is allowable over the cited references for the same reasons given for claim 1 above.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, and 18 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, and 18 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 5, which is allowable.

Claim 12 is allowable at least in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements, including, for example, “supplying a first control signal to the gate driving integrated circuits using a first control line in the gate tape carrier packages so that the gate lines of the image display part may be sequentially driven from the last one to the first one” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 12 for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants’ arguments with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 12, and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is allowable over the cited references for the same reasons given for claim 1 above.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, and 18 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, and 18 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 12, which is allowable.

The rejection of claims 6, 8, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim in view of Murade and further in view of Aoki is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 6 and 8 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 6 and 8 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 5, which is allowable.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 13 and 15 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 13 and 15 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 12, which is allowable.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 26 October 2007

By



Eric J. Nuss

Registration No. **40,106**

McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP

1900 K St. NW

Washington, DC

Tel: 202.496.7500

Attorney for Applicants